REMARKS

Claims 1 - 7 and 9 - 37 remain in the present application.

102 Rejections

Claims 1-17, 26-29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cowan et al (US Patent No. 6,115,743). Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention as claimed in Claims 1-17, 26-29 and 31 is neither shown nor suggested by the Cowan et al. reference.

In accordance with an Examiner interview, Applicant has amended Claim 1 to include a reference to a configuration, performance or functionality characteristic. Applicant respectfully submits that the Cowan reference fails to teach or suggest a system or method as recited in newly amended independent Claim 1, 12, 17, 26 and 31. For example, amended Claim 1 recites in part (emphasis added):

... characteristic of said communications device is a configuration, performance or functionality characteristic ... .

Applicant respectfully submits that the Cowan reference does not teach or suggest parsing and analyzing a configuration, performance or functionality characteristic.

In addition, Applicant respectfully asserts that to the extent the Cowan reference may teach communication of user generated commands and data, the Cowan reference teaches away from the present claimed gathering of information automatically by indicating the commands and data are generated manually [abstract]. Applicant

respectfully asserts that the present Office Action interpretation of Figure 11A of the present application as indicating a user has to manually enter the command is incorrect. The second and third paragraph on page 36 of the present application explains that Figure 11A shows exemplary commands that are automatically configured.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Cowan reference fails to teach or suggest parsing gathered communication device information. For example, amended Claim 1 recites in part (emphasis added):

> including identifying portions of said communication device information
> and correlating said portions of said communication device information to
> an operation or characteristic of a device; ....

Applicant respectfully submits that the Cowan reference does not teach or suggest parsing gathered communication device information. Applicant respectfully asserts that to the extent the Cowan reference may teach communication of commands and data, the Cowan reference teaches away from the present claimed parsing by indicating the commands and data generation requires significant user intervention [Col. 1 lines 28-35, Col. 2 lines 44-58, Col. 3 line 64 –Col. 4 line 11, Col. 5 lines 49-60, Col. 6 lines 30-35, Col. 7 lines 1-10, Col. 9 lines 23-67 and columns 14 – 16].

Applicant respectfully submits that the Cowan reference fails to teach or suggest analyzing characteristics and operations of said network communication device as claimed in the present application. Applicant respectfully asserts that to the extent the Cowan reference may teach fault analysis to detect network outages [Col.7 lines 1 – 10], the Cowan reference does not teach analyzing the characteristics and operations of the network communication device, including configuration, performance or functionality

characteristics. In addition, Applicant respectfully asserts the Cowan reference teaches away from the present claimed analyzing the characteristics and operations of a network device by indicating the user sends commands and data implying the user does the analysis (abstract, Col. 2 lines 11-67, Col. 3 line 64 – Col. 5 line 56, Col. 6 lines 30-67, Col. 7 lines 1-10, Col. 9 line 48 – Col. 10 line 22, Col. 10 line 65 – Col. 11 line 58, Col. 12 line 9 – Col. 13 line 54, Col. 14 line 29 – Col. 15 line 9 and Col. 16 lines 26-47).

Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 2 – 11, 13 – 16, 27 – 30, 32 – 37 are allowable as depending from allowable independent claims 1, 12, 26 and 30 respectively.

103 Rejections

The present Office Action indicates Claims 18-25, 30 and 32-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Cowan et al. (US Patent No. 6,115,743) in view of Tonelli et al (US Patent No. 6,229,540). Applicant respectfully asserts that the present invention is neither shown nor suggested by the Cowan reference and the Tonelli reference, alone or together. In addition, Applicant respectfully asserts there is no motivation or suggestion to combine the Cowan and Tonelli reference to teach the present invention.

Regarding claims 18-23 and 32-36, the present Office Action acknowledges that the Cowan reference fails to show using net rules. Applicant respectfully asserts that even if the present Office Action indication that Cowan and Tonelli references teach an audit tool that may interact with different cards manufactured by different vendors is

correct, the Cowan and Tonelli references do not teach determining the characteristics of a communication device, comparing the results to a set of established net rules and identifying net rule exceptions. Applicant also respectfully asserts that to the extent the Tonelli reference may mention a rules engine, the rules engine is directed to verifying a connection validity to prevent a user from making invalid connections [Col.4 lines 50-58] and not determining the comparison of a communication device characteristics to a set of established net rules.

The present Office Action indicates that Tonelli discloses that device icons correspond to intelligent objects built from templates wherein templates define rules for object instantiation. Applicants respectfully assert that to the extent the Tonelli reference may mention rules defining object instantiation of a device icon on a screen, it does not teach net rules associated with communication devices. Applicant respectfully asserts a rule on how an icon is drawn does not teach net rules. The present Office Action indicates the Tonelli reference uses net rules to change he color of a display. Applicants respectfully assert that to the extent the Tonelli reference mentions color it indicates a user modifies the colors [Col. 17, lines 54 and 55].

The present Office Action also indicates that Tonelli lists several net rules for "auto-installation" but did not provide a cite or indication of approximate location in the Tonelli reference. Applicant has not found a mention of "auto-installation" in the Tonelli reference.

Regarding claim 24, the present Office Action indicates the Cowan reference teaches the audit tool identifies potential causes of problems. Applicant respectfully

asserts the Cowan reference does not teach identification of potential causes of problems.

Regarding claims 25, 30 and 37, the present Office Action acknowledges that the Cowan reference fails to show providing a suggestive course of action for a problem. Applicant respectfully asserts that the Cowan and Tonelli references do not teach providing a suggested corrective course of action for a problem as claimed in the present Application. Applicant also respectfully asserts that even if the present Office Action indication that Cowan and Tonelli references teach an audit tool may identify mismatches thus preventing the user form making invalid connections is correct, the Cowan and Tonelli references do not teach providing suggested corrective course of action to the problem. Applicant respectfully asserts that identifying a mismatch may indicate that a connection is not compatible but does not provide a corrective course of action.

Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts the present Claimed invention is neither shown nor suggested by the Cowan nor Tonelli references, alone or together

Conclusion

In light of the above-listed amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the remaining Claims. The examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO

Date: 4/20 , 2004

John F. Ryan
Reg. No. 47, 050
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060